

MT Children's Trust Fund Meeting (DATE??)

(Stefanie's translation from audio files, 8/28/13. Although I know it was requested several meetings ago that future notes be in a more overview-like form, the content of this meeting seemed to warrant more of a transcription style of note-taking, so that people's words and intentions were actually recorded more accurately. I will be happy to put them in a different form if requested.)

Present: Jamey Petersen, Betty Hall –Munger Wendy Nicolai, Vicky Turner, Nicole Johnson, Patty Butler (came after speaking engagement), Richard Oppen (briefly)

On Phone: Mary Gallagher (defacto president/chair), Lisa Stroh, Joanne Eder.

Absent: Roberta Kipp

Mary opened meeting and introduced herself (stepping in as defacto president/chair) because Betty Hidalgo was not reappointed by the governor. She would like to put off elections at the next face-to-face meeting in September, as this meeting was specially called due to so many changes that have happened.

She welcomed Betty back to the board, who hasn't been involved for about a year and ½, lots has happened since then. Jamey and Betty met yesterday and Jamey is trying to recruit her to help w/ community café since she has experience with that.

Agenda:

Mary asked about a few changes to the agenda. Jamey added a few more specifics for herself to speak about and then broke things out time-wise so that they could have a spot for Dir. Oppen to speak - as he had time on his schedule and wanted to drop by and say hello. Jamey explained that he only really started his job in April and has been trying to get up to speed with everything. Mary would like to invite him to their next meeting which will be more formal and Jamey said that should also be possible.

Lisa: Again, I think the agenda needs to be the board's agenda, not Jamey's. We need to be able to say we want the Director at the next meeting, not this one, and need to keep it as we set it. This is our committee and I think that's really important. I wasn't prepared at all.

Jamey: As I stated, I haven't added anything, it was just something that he expressed interested in the chance to welcome the board members and introduce himself.

Lisa: did you mention that to Mary? Jamey: yes I mentioned it a couple of times.

In the past, Betty H. had always sent me the agenda and asked me to touch it up and put the times in, etc. because we have to have a time-line for our meeting.

Lisa: let's just remember in the future to do it the other way.

Jamey: I understand that this was a short timeline for this meeting, I did send the agenda to Mary last night and didn't have any response by this morning, so it is what it is. But we can work on whatever procedure you would like.

Wendy(?) If I could just interject, I work w/ Dir Oppen on boards and councils and in his defense, one of the things he's beginning to do extremely well is to attend many of the meetings in person or by telephone. This was just his way of wanting to introduce himself to you today and I think from here

anyone can determine what his role will be in your next board meeting. I would hope that you would not be too adverse to him sticking his head in for 5-10 minutes today.

Mary: We just like to know about these things ahead of time, I didn't get her note until 15 minutes ago. You did mention it and I remember saying that I would like to wait until the September meeting. (Jamey brought up the concerns from the last board meeting about the despair that he hadn't greeted the board yet so he wanted to make that happen.) Mary said (Lisa's) point is well-taken and that it is the board's agenda. There are things we'd like to say to the Director and we will say those things at the September meeting. We will welcome him today, I just don't want to have anything inserted into the agenda, it's been a problem and we'll have to work on that from this point forward.

Let's just go ahead, we'll meet him in 15 minutes, and see where we get before then. Lisa: I think that's all we can do at this point.

Betty: I think in the past there have been some communication breakdowns, but I would like to see more collaboration between the board and the department in putting the agenda together because as we've done in many meetings in the past that I was a part of as technical assistant, we were bringing things forward from both of those perspectives. It's important that we all work together and get off on the right foot.

Mary said that is one of the items on our agenda, to address that relationship and we just haven't had time in the last 6 months to do so, but we're hoping to improve that relationship. And Jamey and I did have a conversation about what we needed on there. It's ongoing. There is a bit of learning curve for the department about what this particular board needs and wants and expects.

Lisa: we are not an agency of DPHHS, and we are really the dog and they are the tail, that's the way this board was constructed. But the last 6 months have been really rocky because we've been TOLD what we're doing. That's not the nature of this board and I feel very strongly about that. Mary agreed.

A question was asked about minutes from past meetings; Mary wants to wait until September's meeting to approve those.

Nat'l Alliance update: We've been in contact with that representative and have had some discussions about the overlapping role that Betty H played when she was taken off the board. She had a term that lasts for 2 years, so we've been in contact people there who say that if we choose to have Betty H. finish her term there, as president and liaison, that is a choice we can make even though she is not still on our board. I know that she was abruptly taken off the board in the middle of things, it was a surprise, and she had a lot to offer at the national level too. Is there a suggestion? They are willing to take a resolution from the board for her to continue to the end of her term. (Jamey read the email from the Alliance with details about this. Lisa reiterated her opinion that it's not up to Jamey to dictate what the board does.)

Lisa feels we should keep Betty as the representative for the board on the nat'l Alliance.

Joanne feels that if we go ahead and do the resolution, then when we get the call we've already done it. So she proposed a resolution that: Whereas the board recognizes the important work and leadership that the children's trust fund board member, Betty Hidalgo, has performed as the CTF's representative for the national alliance... and whereas the governor has announced that Betty Hidalgo's term on the children's trust fund has expired and whereas continuity of leadership and communication with the nat'l organization is an important priority for the MT Children's Trust Fund board, we hereby resolve that Betty Hidalgo will continue to serve as the MCTF representative on the National Alliance... board for the

remainder of her term in through 2015. The MCTF will request any necessary expenditures for attendance at the meetings. (Jamey requested Joanne email that to her, as it wasn't possible to get all that quickly in the notes, which Joanne said she would do.) Lisa seconded.

Mary asked for discussion:

Betty: I have a question and am a little confused at the timeline. The email here from Theresa is dated July 15th, and Betty's appointment was terminated when? July 1st? The day after she signed all the grantee letters, etc. (Jamey provide the date as June 24th.) Theresa is spelling out THEIR procedure.

Lisa responded: This again is an issue, I'm going to go by what our chairman's info is, would she be a voting or non-voting member? Mary said she would then be a voting member on our board. She would be our representative to the national board until her term expires.

Patty Butler: it looks to me like it's not until her time expires, but rather until November when elections are held again. Mary clarified what Theresa is talking about: She has had conversations w/ their board chair and said a resolution would be fine. We can try this and then if they need more. Patty still questioned what seems to be a difference between what Theresa said and what the document in front of her seems to be saying? She seems to be clear in telling us what the process is about holding elections each fall and at that time we would be able to nominate someone from our board to sit on the national alliance. So it seems we don't need a resolution now, because their nominations aren't due til November.

Lisa wants to have a resolution so she can be on the board til November. Joanne said that since her term isn't up until 2015, she wouldn't be up for election this fall. Betty asked what happens to anyone, once they're off a board, what does that do their membership on the nat'l alliance?

Lisa: What we're saying is that we, as a board, would like her to be on that board as a past president because Betty Hidalgo provides a wealth of historical and current information and I would hate to see her off that board. The chain of events has been appalling at best and seems obvious that people outside our board do not want her on our board or the national board. What I'm saying is that I want her on our board so that she can stay on the national board. I think if she's not on that board, it will be the beginning of the demise of this board.

Patty said as a member of the board, I realize you're speaking for the board (Lisa: "No, I'm speaking for me." Patty: "I don't know who's running the meeting, is that you, Mary?" "Yes." "Could you call for questions so we can discuss this proposal that's on the floor?" "Yes, I did." Patty: "Ok, great. I go back to the bylaws and membership is not done by resolution. It's done by appt by the governor for 3 year terms and from Theresa at the national level, it says that you have to be a CTF member in order to be nominated to be on the nat'l board, which makes sense. I'm not sure that the proposal that's on the table right now, with a motion and a second, is something we can even vote on. I'm not sure we're following the rules both nationally and within our state to carry this forward. I understand your concern, but I would think we need some direction here as to whether it's legal to do this, so we don't do something that isn't correct.

Lisa: "But Patty, our bylaws are not... I mean, the whole way this board has operated has not been on the up and up. I think for additional information to come in that was solicited is not an appropriate use of that person's position... I know that there have been conversations with Mary and Betty w/ the national board and this is what they said we could do, so I'm going to go by that information. I guess if

it's wrong, they'll tell us. But I don't think that we can postpone this. We need to decide as a board if we want Betty on there or not because there's been great strides to not have her on there.

Joanne said one thing that was mentioned before is that we're not guaranteed a slot in any case, on the nat'l alliance, and we've never had a representative before Betty. She was selected and we were very honored because not every state or trust fund is represented. The fact that she was represented because of her qualifications and that MT was represented for the first time, I think we need to do what we can to maintain that connection throughout her tenure which is 2015. So it's up to the nat'l alliance to decide whether they're going to accept this or not, but we need to make the effort. We're not trying to replace her with someone who's not been approved, we're just trying to keep her there. We are often left out of these conversations on the national level and we need to maintain that contact. This is the best way to do it, to have a resolution.

Patty: There are 2 sentences here, and I need to be clear, I don't think this is solicited information. Jamey did her job in reporting to the national alliance that we have a change in our membership, and as a result of that Theresa responded to that, but it wasn't a solicitation on Jamey's part. I just want to be clear that I think Jamey did her job.

Lisa interrupted and said we can talk about it later, but there needs to be communication w/ Mary, the chair. And she agrees with Joanne.

As does Mary, who was looking for the email from Theresa but was paraphrasing "as long as the board approves a representative, that is up to us, and if we choose to continue having Betty as our representative, that is fine. She didn't know what the term was, so that is why this makes the most sense. We're not going against the bylaws. She is not a member of our board, she is being our representative who happens to know more than anyone on our board about the issues that are going on at the national level. I think this makes complete sense to do this and let the nat'l alliance deal with it in the way they wish. I realize there is some animosity towards Betty by some of the people on this conference call, but I think we need to look beyond that... if we're going to be working together and this other grant comes along, we'll need all the help we can get. So I'd like to pass this resolution, and if there's another piece that we need to deal w/ in September, then we'll know where we stand. I do think it's important for this to be done by the chair and board members, and not by the grant manager who asked different questions than were discussed. So, shall we take a vote on it?

Patty voted no.

Joanne voted yes.

Betty thinks it needs more investigation and wants to make it clear that she is not here w/ any animosity towards Betty Hidalgo, whom she has worked with for 12 or 13 years. So this is very difficult for her and she had no idea she was going to walk into a hornet's nest this morning and is very upset about that. She's not sure she can vote. She feels there is a lot of confusion about communication from the national and state level. Asked for a vote, she said maybe it wouldn't hurt to send in something. Mary apologized that she's in such a spot. Betty does think that the representative should be a member of the board.

Final vote: "Yes, I guess."

Lisa voted yes.

Mary asked Jamey to type up Joanne's resolution and send it to her to sign.

Patty asked that it be made clear that her vote no has nothing personally to do w/ Betty, she doesn't even know her well enough to have any animosity, so she wants that to be very clear. But she does believe that representation to a national board should certainly have membership on a state board which is why she voted no.

Jamey asked Mary if she has a vote or does she not vote? Mary was unsure, but Patty doesn't think so. Mary only needs the resolution, not the vote tally since it passed 3 to 1. Jamey asked if we were done w/ this section since Director Oppen is here.

Lisa added another comment that she feels the communication with the nat'l alliance from this point forward needs to be with Mary and not Jamey, since Jamey's responsibility with them ended after she reported the change in membership to the alliance. Jamey feels there is need for clarification because she DOES have communication w/ the Nat'l Alliance on a regular basis since they send her materials which is her only avenue for receiving those. Mary said that with a lot of information which is programmatic, that's appropriate. But when it comes to dealing with board member issues specifically, with things that need to be addressed specifically w/ the board, the chair will try to clarify those as we go. And that will be an ongoing process because we haven't worked w/ you guys for a long time, we dealt w/ Robin for years and we need some clarification on it too.

Jamey: sure. But Robin told me that she was the one who nominated Betty originally and sent the letter in and worked w/ them, so I'm just following what's been done before. If we could just get it down in writing what my duties are, that would probably be helpful to all of us. Mary hopes to help get some of that worked out at the meeting in September.

Visit from Director Oppen:

I'm Richard Oppen, the director. I've been here for 15 minutes or so and it's been a fascinating discussion. Not a terribly encouraging one, but fascinating. (someone tried to interrupt, but he asked them to let him finish.) Obviously we're in a time of change right now w/ the children's trust fund. We're changing the board makeup. Transition times are difficult, we have a new administration. I've been tied up w/ the legislature for the 1st 4 months of my job, trying to figure out my job since then. I want to be more involved in the children's trust fund now, more engaged, because the subject matter is so important to everybody in the state. I WILL be more engaged. I think it's great that people have discussions and disagreements and work on issues together; we're never going to get unanimous decisions on things as difficult as this. But there were some things in the conversation that troubled me. Some things about accusations of hostility towards Betty, which I do not believe exist here. Accusations of phone calls made... that kind of stuff concerns me. That is not legitimate discourse, that is jumping to conclusions and it's accusatory. And that's the kind of stuff that has to change if this board is going to be functional rather than dysfunctional. If there are hard feelings about Betty no longer being on the board, I understand that, but you need to get over it. You need to be productive. You need to realize that the department is here to be a partner with the board and we're not here to have some kind of antagonistic relationship that ends up as a power struggle. So I'm really glad actually that I got to hear a little bit of this discussion, it was very enlightening for me. And let this be the last discussion that took on this kind of tone, would be my suggestion.

Mary replied: One of the things we did put on the agenda was that we wanted to address this directly (we didn't get to it), but we want to address some of the specifics so that it's not seen as just accusatory. We're not going to be on the defensive, we're going to be stating facts about what we've had to deal with and the differences from one agency to the next, so I'm hoping it will be productive. It's worse to

sweep it under the rug. We don't want to do that. We want to be partners too, and we expect to have assistance in that role and not be led around by an entity that doesn't know what they're doing. (Director Oppen asked "who is this entity that doesn't know what it's doing?" Mary replied "The children's trust fund board, we don't want that feeling that decisions are made in the Director's office... and rather than not having this be a welcoming thing for you, I'm glad you did get to hear some of this, and if you wouldn't mind coming to our next meeting for a short, more specific discussion, we were going to have a committee put together so that it's not just accusations and it's specific things that have led to this. We'd like to flesh that out so we can start anew if that will work with the department.

Dir Oppen: if I'm in town I will be happy to attend that next meeting and I'll attend as many as I possibly can. But again, I just want to point out that when you say things like "being led around by someone who doesn't know what they're doing," that's the kind of thing that steps over the line of legitimate confrontation of issues into the accusatory nature, so that's what has to stop.

Lisa: "Dr. Oppen (you gave me a promotion, said Dir Oppen, I'm not a doctor by the way!) I think Mary said it very well, the committee has specific issues that I think we should talk about at the September meeting, it's very important to us as a board that's administratively attached to DPHHS, to not be... and I'll tell ya, Mary's words are exactly what's happening, is that we are not administratively attached the way we are working, decisions have been made behind our backs, and we'll talk about it specifically, but we have to address these issues so that we can go on and deal w/ kids. We aren't just figureheads here that are told "this has been decided and it's a CTF board decision". We're smart people. So we need to flesh those out at the next meeting. Administratively attached is that. That doesn't mean we're an agent of DPHHS and that's the way that we have been treated. And I would hope that you as the director can regain back where we were in our roles. A grant manager does not tell us what we're doing. We're smart enough and our board needs to be an independent board that's administratively attached. So I think in person, we can talk about that more, but as a board member, the last few meetings have not gone well because things are much, much different than what administratively attached means.

Mary: Well, the role has expanded. And I apologize if the words I used seem harsh but in reality, that has been many of the board members' perspective. And I'm hoping that we can get over that and work productively w/ newly defined roles for the relationship w/ the department so that there is respect on both sides and we actually can get down to the work that we had been doing. That's all there is to it, we've just got to work it out and be respectful in the process but clear that... the trust fund board is not going to be defined by the prevention resource center or the... whatever role they have in mind for the trust fund board, that is really undefined to us but seems to be encroaching on the trust fund board. That's what we have to clarify, it's very different than it was in the past. And the level of respect in deference to the board, yet still getting the information that we need to operate from the grants manager is key, that is our goal. I didn't mean to get into this discussion, and we thought you were going to be at the next meeting, but at least this is a head's up so we don't have to talk in generalities, but be specific, and so that you can understand what the particulars are that have led us to this point of frustration.

Lisa: And Doctor Oppen, Betty and I did talk with you at the capitol and had said that Mary and Betty had tried to talk with you about these issues and they've been told that they can't talk with you about that, and it's been on 2 or 3 occasions. It would have been better to have resolved it before this time. I don't know where that went wrong. Betty was the chairman of our board and Mary was the vice-chair and they tried several times. It's not that you're saying that you don't want to talk with us because that day at the capitol you said sure I'll meet with them, but at 9 o'clock that morning was when Betty got the call that she was off the board. But I really think that when the chairman of the trust fund board

requests a meeting with you should be let in to talk with you. I think that's part of the issue here is that we've been excluded and refused having the communication with you. I think we need to work together, it's the only way we can, and keep our eyes on these kids.

Dir Oppen: There are some perspectives here that are somewhat skewed, I have to be honest with you, and it's not your fault, it's just the way it is because we haven't communicated. But they weren't excluded from my office; they just couldn't barge in when I was in meetings. Every attempt to meet with me was when I was meeting with somebody else and they couldn't come in right then and there, and I just couldn't do it. I have an agency to run and have a lot of meetings in a day and a lot of responsibilities. I'm not whining about that, but there are perspectives here and people jump to conclusions about the way things are, so it is good to talk about these issues. But it has to be done respectfully if this board is going to function well. And that's a two-way street because you need to respect our staff as well. They're here to help you, they are very, very good at their job, they are NOT trying to be conspiratorial, they are not trying to hide information from you, and we are here to form a better partnership.

Lisa felt we should just talk about it all in September. She asked Dir. Oppen about his background, if he has dealt with child abuse issues before. He was the director of DEQ, another state agency, and his wife is a school psychologist and has dealt with battered women's shelters, etc, so it's been an issue for our family forever, but he has not worked with it directly. Mary said there is a lot of information out there and that perhaps the reason the change has been so hard for us is that we're really on the brink of doing some wonderful things. And Dir. Oppen said "we're here to help you do wonderful things."

Director Oppen left, saying we will do this more officially in September.

CDC grants:

Mary: There is not much news except that they will know in September who the grantees are, and she said it's important for us to keep a united front. Jamey has not heard anything either except that it had been submitted, and that's all we know. Mary thanked her for sending out what we had as it was useful to see it all in one spot. And we've got the grant writer paid, so all of our obligations so far are met. It would be great to know before our meeting in September, but not sure. They want to start in October, so one would hope we get a little bit of time before that. Patty noted that her department has 2 big grants out and the one with CVC had a June 1st notification date but they haven't started the review yet. Apparently, sequestration has slowed everything down and the awarding of grant money is particularly fuzzy right now. Everyone is just waiting.

Mary said that's realistic so we may be having a special meeting in October or November about it. She wanted to say that there is a leadership team that was pulled together really quickly and it's a real crackerjack team. There's all sorts of representation through the universities, stakeholders and particularly the different agencies/bureaus. Jamey listed more specific folks and said they are willing to leverage their funds against this one, and that gave us an edge. Jamey is really excited about it and thinks we made a competitive grant in a short time, so kudos to us. The team as a whole took time out of their busy schedules and it wouldn't have happened w/o everyone on the team. Mary thinks that, even with any gaps we might have missed, one of the pros for a grant like this is going to be that a CDC team comes and helps us figure out how to make things a reality, we won't be out there on our own.

Vicky: Having Ellen Bush on board was really helpful, too. And also she wanted to thank Jamey because she was trying to get this done, and also the contracts out the door too and a lot of other duties in early June – operating “with her hair on fire” to get all the pieces done. Mary noted that it added a lot of hours to her schedule which were probably not easy to find, and we appreciate that and we didn’t really mean to set that in her lap but that’s where it went. Vicky said it’s a wonderful example of how the department helped out, finding money to pay her, support from our legal staff to get things pushed through, admin support for grants.gov. All the behind-the-scenes time, including myself because I was the one who had to push the final button. She just wanted to say that during this time when the board might not feel supported, that was something that really showed how much support there really is.

Mary agrees and said there was some confusion about the “lead agency” and how that would work in terms of the department role and the role of the board, those are pieces that we’ll work with down the road if we get this. And leading into our next discussion... she thinks that clarification of those roles and understanding what these behind the scenes things are that an administratively responsible department does for the CTF will help. Thanks to everyone who worked on this.

For those who sat in on the final board meeting, we usually don’t have a lot of special meetings, but we had to have one and it keeps us up to speed. On a big grant like this, the department defines its processes, coordinating w/ outside agencies. A lot of the work does come internally for the department, this one maybe more than others, does require dept. examination/coordination for a common language and a common goal. That’s exciting because we are better than the sum of our parts if we can get that done.

Other comments? Lisa: is there anything, in trying to go forward, that is written down that says what “administratively attached” mean? Betty HM responded that from her past experience with the board that she suggested that we take some time and go through the law that pertains to this board. There are several places/statutes that explain very clearly the role of the department and the board. I think it’s key for new members, administratively attached is pretty well defined in the law and has a lot to do w/ the money/grants/contracts. She knows Mary was around then, but doesn’t think that the whole board every really understood as well as they should the role as it pertains to the law. She spoke about a few details of the law. The key is in the law. Mary said that after Betty left, they did have a meeting w/ a facilitator to help them discuss it. She disagrees that the role of the admin agency wasn’t understood but it leads into our next topic.

Dealing with that very issue. She has read the bylaws and the chair is allowed to appt committees to deal w/ issues as they come up. Rather than have us spend a lot of time on it now even though we are thinking about it a lot, she would like to put together a committee to discuss the relationship of the board and the department. Then come back to us at the next meeting and address specifics that we are dealing with now with the department, and highlight the roles as described in the statute (which she thinks has a lots of holes and leaves a lot open to interpretation) so that we as a board can function to function properly a better definition of our role w/ the department. So that we don’t have to put someone on the spot and have this ongoing sense that people are acting outside of their roles. There is a whole new entity of the Prevention Resource Center with Vicky that no one told us about. We just have our grant manager and we need to figure out what role Vicky plays.

Wendy asked to intervene for a minute as she has to leave soon: a couple of things that may be helpful to you. Our legal dept is currently doing a review of your bylaws and expects that to be done by Aug 7th, so that may be helpful and clarify some things. The other piece is that when Anna Whiting Sorrell left the dept she did a small reorganization that included my becoming manager of several depts. in the

director's office. The prevention resource center is one among others. Her goal was to really keep business moving. The PRC reports to me, Jamey reports to Vicky as the person who's running the PRC, so that's what the connection looks like up here in the Director's Office. Mary thanked her for the clarification. And the legal review will help, and said they were invited to have input into the legal review but not sure what the mechanism is for that. Wendy said that if you, individually or as a board have comments about the bylaws in going forward, you could: send an email to Wendy (or Jamey, who would then send it to Wendy) and she would work with the attorney who's doing the review. They'd very much like your input, especially if you see something in the bylaws that are of concern to you. She will have Jamey send her email address to Mary right after this meeting.

Mary: we have in the past worked w/ the legal dept and were told we have access to them and should take advantage of that.

Wendy: Are you all in agreement that you would communicate with me directly about this?

Mary: I would also like to have direct communication about anything the board finds so I can jot things down explanations as we go.

Wendy: So Mary will be the direct contact for the board. It was also suggested that the attorney who worked on the bylaws would come to the next board meeting, which Wendy knows is all about scheduling, etc. That might be a good way to proceed w/ a bylaw review.

Mary: "Certainly, if it's done in good faith, that would be the key. We want some consistency, we don't want one interpretation from last year and then another from this year. Mainly, we dealt with an alleged conflict of interest issue w/ the attorneys the last time, with Mick and Robin involving the contract dept.

Wendy: "I wasn't involved with that last year, but in reference to your "good faith" comment, you know, we sitting here certainly trust the abilities of our legal department, particularly the attorney that's going to work on your bylaws, so I hope you will also engage in that trust."

Mary: "well, that's great, and for the most part in reviewing it didn't see anything out of order, but there may be some things to add to it for clarification.

Joanne also suggested that it would be helpful for the board to all look at Jamey's job description and Mary agreed and said "because certainly next time we'll want to look at not just the work plan but the expectations that are in there." She asked Jamey if she or Vicky has the job description.

Vicky: "We both do and for clarification, last fall it was sent out 2 or 3 times to the board so they could add their input and we drafted one based on what was there before with some minor changes. Certainly that can always be updated and adjusted going forward. I worry about language like "next time"...?

Mary said she meant in September.

Joanne thinks it would be a helpful starting point for discussion because that's what Jamey's going on. (Lisa?) asked for that to be emailed to everyone. Mary doesn't know how it all gets done in a ½ time position and we knew it was going to be difficult.

Leading into the next committee discussion, Mary would like to appt a board committee to put some of this stuff together so we have it for our next discussion. She asked Joanne if she would be willing to be

on it and Roberta? And Lisa? “And Patricia is new so we won’t bother her with that, and Betty, we’ll look forward to your comments when we have the meeting.”

Clarification of the committee’s “charge” was requested: Mary will also be a member of it so she can recall from the phone meeting, she’s made a list of some of the things Betty said, etc, and then some of our legal review and our board experiences.” Then we’ll figure out a mechanism to perhaps have the dept look at and come up w/ a response/discussion, so they know what the agenda items will be for the September meeting.

Patty asked to be clear: So 4 of the 7 board members are going to be on this committee, Mary, Joanne, Roberta and Lisa, and will there be minutes taken and distributed?

Mary: Yes. A “report” of the meeting could be made available before the next meeting so that people can chew on it. Patty said the other 3 of us would appreciate that.

Mary: “I don’t want any surprises and I don’t think much of it will be new, but it would be helpful to have a discussion about the legal review and some of the things that Wendy talked about. And then we can have an honest discussion about various feelings and that will be more productive.

Joanne asked to have a Doodle to set the time for the meeting and Joanne will have Jamey help her start that.

Mary: the next committee is the Technical Assistance that we’ve talked about for a year. Notice the gaps in what we’ve had/not had since the HMHB contract was not renewed and when Betty went off that contract. She doesn’t know if it’s easier to have both things combined into one committee – we’re all in different ways missing the technical assistance contract we had, would this be a natural outcome of the discussions you have, or would you like to keep it separate? We’ve only got a month.

Joanne said it’s hard because she doesn’t like doing all this without everybody. Mary was thinking only about making recommendations – she’s the one that brought this up but has never had a chance to draft anything. The last time we talked, it wasn’t right for discussion. Joanne said that Patty and Betty have a lot to contribute to this as well, Betty’s been there! Lisa thinks the same. It would be better if we all could just talk about it. If the people who are really interested in having a technical assistant could draft something like a job description, what it might consist of.

Mary: how does that sound? Sometimes, she might put too much faith in committees, but if we can do it in the regular board meeting that would be a good starting point.

Joanne: Let’s just come up with a list of tasks that would be helpful in assisting the board.

Mary: some of it does depend on defining the role of “administratively attached” and Jamey’s job description. There it we talk about the committee recommendations before the meeting, then it may help gel some ideas. Approved.

We are still down 1 board member, Mary spoke to Stacy and they have some ideas but until they make the decision the board is free to make recommendations for other people. (next couple of days?)

Lisa thinks it’s really important when we look at makeup of our board, the eastern part of state is not represented at all. Glendive/Sidney/Scobey? A good point, all agreed. Jamey said they have a native American woman from Fort Peck that they were considering as well. A discussion ensued about how eastern MT has changed and Lisa feels that even more important than the reservation, she perceives the

reservation is relatively isolated, we need someone from way east. Mary spoke to the level of chaos and child abuse that can happen when people are away from their family support systems. Joanne asked Mary to make that request to the Governor and felt the person from the reservation would be a good choice, disagreed w/ Lisa about their not being that impacted by Bakken.

Purple contract renewal:

Mary said Melissa wasn't quite ready to send the report, but they are putting some info together in the next couple of weeks for us. Mary wanted to see if we were generally inclined to renew that contract with them. We want to make sure they have checked off the boxes for the info required for the grant, and that they are up to par so far in meeting their responsibilities. Mary sent the info to the board, as did Jamey with some points to consider, and also attached the "meat" of the purple contract so you can compare. When Mary went through it, we had included all three doses, so obviously they're still doing Dose 1 now. She thinks we need to look at it and there are things that haven't been accomplished, but that we perhaps took too much from the Jeff Linkenbach recommendations last summer. They were a lot more vague than they needed to be and we owe it to them to be clearer and also delete things that are not going in the direction we're going. What they've found is that some hospitals initially contacted (they are at 62%) were not adhering to the protocol when followed up, etc. and have had to go back to them. Mary and Jamey had a 2 ½ hour meeting w/ them on Monday.

Jamey thinks they need to be more face to face, to ensure that we push them for more travel/face-time, 80% of their budget is in personnel and staff. They are also reluctant to move into Dose 2 until they have that 80% of hospitals on board but Jamey thinks we're missing some opportunities. With a contract that big, she doesn't understand why we can't use Nicole more to establish relationships with some of these organizations. Melissa said for it to be truly evidence-based, we need to have that 80%, but Jamey said for THIS contract it's not that crucial because it's not a federal grant? We are missing too many opportunities to move this forward, get them out there, and Nicole is here to help too. Also, Mary and Jamey both encouraged them to be more specific in their reporting, fewer generalities, we are interested in what came out of some of those meetings, etc.

Mary was pleased to know that they know they're at 62% and gaining, and wouldn't push Dose 2 on them until they're ready. Nicole's role has changed now, she's gone back to being Jamey's asst. But she agrees they need more face to face. Part of what she realized is that a lot of their time goes into reporting/meeting w/ us, which isn't really productive for them. Their pressure comes from the Nat'l to do it right and have gotten their hands slapped a few times and we need to honor that. If there are other pieces Nicole can do in next 6 months, (like her work w/ their intern from Carroll college, which Nicole told us about.)

Mary: Do we renew the contract/MOU the hospitals after that 1st time? Betty said, once the hospital signs the contract w/ the Nat'l Purple and receive their materials etc, they are good to go. They don't have to renew it. One thing she found when serving in other states, that some of them are implementing Dose 1 and 2 at the same time, depends on state capacity, etc. At the time of Betty's last involvement, the Nat'l was ok w/ MT just being MT and doing what we could do, like if a hospital signs on, we can then get into that community and get Dose 2 going, and then having a celebration so you're hitting Dose 1, 2, 3 at the same time. Maybe that's changed, unsure.

Joanne has to leave in 10 minutes and asked if we think we can work with them, or do we need to re-compete? That's the decision we have to make immediately? Correct.

It's gotten very complicated for a small organization. There was discussion about how they can make this happen. It's a 9-month contract.

Mary: Shall we vote on whether we should re-compete or should be redefine a few things and try to just get them out there where they need to be.

Patty moved that we do not offer another RFP but instead renew the contract with modifications for HMHB. (Outside the motion, she suggested we perhaps form a committee to look at this and help make the objective clearer and more attainable.)

Second, Joanne: passed.

Date for the next meeting:

September 23rd? (Dir Oppen could make it then.)

Do we just need one day?

Monday 23rd will be our meeting, Tues 24th, /Wed 25th is the grantees meeting, (with Wednesday being the day when the grantees get to speak about their organization and when Jamey would hope board members can attend if possible.) So carrying the meeting over to Tues would be preferable, since that day isn't as crucial for board members to attend the grantees meeting. Then there is an ACES summit Sept 26/27th that people may want to also attend.

Lisa and Roberta have the farthest to travel. Can we start at 8:30? Yes.

September 23rd, 8:30am.

Jamey wants to talk about her struggle w/ getting responses from the board, if we could say maybe once a week the board checks their email to see if there is board business? Tell her how best to communicate with you? Needs feedback, doesn't hear anything, then sometimes she has to make decisions on her own because she hasn't heard back from anyone. Lisa wondered if Mary as the chair, and being in Helena can be our voice, but Jamey said that sometimes it needs to be communication/concurrence from every voting member and can't be deferred to someone else. She feels she has tried every form of communicating with board members, phone/email, and still has gotten no response and is very frustrated. Mary pointed out that some members have a hard time getting phone/email service too... but ultimately, Jamey feels that if it is her job to communicate with the board, then if they don't communicate back – are they the right person to serve as a board member, because that is a legitimate question. She tries to mark emails as important when they are.

For Lisa, email is the best for her and she will try to be better about responding. She knows Roberta doesn't get a lot of her emails. Mary will poll the board members before the next meeting to see how the best way to communicate with them is and understands there are difficulties.

Jamey's other concerns: When she first came on it was very hectic (until basically last week), but now she feels she has things settled down, she's working 8-1 M-Th, typically is trying to have more back and forth with the grantees, new contracts, payments (end of fiscal year was June 30th.) She feels she's finally in a position where she knows how to fulfill her role. Mary said that she would appreciate more calls about that role, since she feels there may be a different understanding of that role through the prevention resource center.

But Jamey thinks that generally speaking, her role is to manage the grants and keep the board up to speed with that. Some things have been kind of shaky, but it's getting better and she doesn't want the board to think that they have to micromanage this position because they do have more important things to do. It's something we're all working on, and once we get comfortable with each other we will all be able to stay on our own tasks and she will be able to help the board achieve their goals too.

Mini-grants:

ACES meeting: Jamey forward info to the board with all the details. Spoke about the leaders who will be there who are very important, community participants from all over the state. It's hopefully an opportunity for our grantees if they can possibly be there. Patty clarified that there are opportunities for 2 different mini-grants, yes. Some could come to this one, and some could come to the Great Beginnings one, and some are on those councils too. We could offer them 2 opportunities and if they're interested and respond we can evaluate what their needs are. Childwise is sponsoring the ACEs event. Mary asked Vicky about her sponsoring an ACE summit this fall? Vicky doesn't have an ACE summit, it's this one coming up sponsored by Childwise. But this spring we had an ACEs training, which Jamey was able to come to. That was to look at how ACEs impacts substance abuse.

Patty said the Great Beginnings comes out of Child family services and it's free because we had some grant monies. Within that agenda there is an opportunity to learn a bit about ACEs, not as much as the summit, though. It depends on what you want to support w/ your mini-grants, Great Beginnings will talk about a lot of opportunities, and the ACEs one will be all about that. Lisa said really we need to decide if we want to put that out there to see if there's interest? Yes.

We need to decide if we are going to offer some scholarships for people either go to the ACEs summit that is right after our grantee's meeting, or to the Great Beginnings in August. Jamey will crunch some numbers about what it would cost, but she will say that last year we had \$6,000 in our mini-grant budget and we didn't spend any of it and we have the same amount this year. Are there other plans to use that? We also have \$75,000 in our special project budget.

Lisa thinks it would be good to offer the same amount whichever they decide to go to. And do we need to limit it to just our grantees or might they know of someone who should attend and could they go? it there's a parent or something, would we open that up to them? As board members, we'd like to go too?

Patty: could we just offer up to a \$500 scholarship to the grantees and board members and let them decide who would best be the person to come? (That's a lot of money, 16 grantees, but people doubted if very many would even apply.) Patty came up with the idea of offering this as a minigrant to our grantees, but also offer to cover expenses for our board members out of the special project fund?

Mary glad this was brought up, as part of our emphasis is to make sure all of our grantees are aware of childhood trauma. She asked Patty to make a motion:

She moved that we offer all of our grantees up to \$500 to attend either or both of the upcoming conferences, the Great Beginnings and the ACEs summit, how much of that spent is up to them and they submit their proposals to us. I also move that the CTF pay for the board members to attend these also if they choose to, out of the Special Project Budget. Lisa seconded. Passed.

Jamey will get that rolling. Lisa and Patty both need to leave.

Jamey: the grantees meeting is still in draft form because she hasn't gotten comments back from all the board members, but she outlined what will happen and who will speak. She is also trying to get the Salish Kootenai to come/share for this meeting. Also Robin may offer some Train the Trainer stuff. Second day is spent on grantees sharing, each have 30 minutes. The first day they are also trying to do a community café. Jamey asked for other suggestions, feedback, people to speak? Mary? Patty? Patty would be glad to have someone speak. Send suggestions to Jamey.

Upcoming events:

Nicole and Jamey have been working on ideas to raise awareness and revenues for the CTF. Nicole had some ideas about a fall event, perhaps a Halloween event at the mall? Have them hand out candy/ give out information/make it a fun community event to get our name out there. Encourage our grantees to do the same thing on a local level. Participate in Festival of Trees? Sponsorships? Can we use Mountainwest Bank to do a psa that says Mountainwest bank supports... etc. "Be safe and come to the MCTF's 1st annual event at the mall" or something. Mary asked Jamey and Nicole to take the lead on those ideas, yes, and then report back to the board in September w/ more concrete details? All worth doing. If anyone thinks of anything, let Jamey know, to engage people and raise awareness and ultimately raise funds. We can't just start w/ a big gala and a sit-down dinner, but we can start small.

Nicole has been working on a newsletter for us, primitive stages, talked to Purple about using some of their info, tips, changes to CTF, etc, share resources, events, feedback. Start with a smaller group of people to send it out to, eventually get DPHHS to help send it out to more people. OPI? Etc. We've asked for feedback from our grantees.

Mary, to add, from our conversation w/ Purple. We realize the website for CTF is very static and maybe some of that from HMHB could also get cut and pasted there? Jamey: With the money in special projects, the board may be able to revamp the website, or it was once suggested to use last year's tech assistance money for that?

Public comment? No.

Adjourned. Thanks to everyone for doing this and we will reconvene hopefully with all the muscle work that needs to be done, and also another thanks to Wendy for her help. Jamey will try to send some emails out today and have the minutes transcribed. She will also make sure that an important emails will be clicked with the "important" flag.